## REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated March 7, 2007. Claims 1-17 are currently pending. Because no claim changes have been made, it is respectfully requested that this amendment after final be entered.

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 8-15 contain allowable subject matter.

Note that a Rule 132 Declaration is attached hereto in order to explain and evidence why the material in the specification relied on in the rejection is not prior art.

Claims 1-2 stand rejected under Section 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over alleged admitted prior art in view of Kazunari. This Section 103(a) rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

The alleged admitted prior art (APA) is not prior art – see the Rule 132 Declaration of K. Maeda attached hereto. The description set forth in the instant specification at page 5, lines 10-21, relied on by the Examiner, is *not* "prior art." [Rule 132 Decl. of K. Maeda, ¶3-5]. Thus, it will be appreciated that the problem recited from page 5, line 22 to page 7, line 7, of the instant specification is not prior art to the instant application. [Rule 132 Decl. of K. Maeda, ¶6]. Because these features/problem are not prior art, they cannot be relied on in a Section 103(a) rejection. Thus, the Section 103(a) rejection is fundamentally flawed as being based on non-prior art material, and should be withdrawn. A more detailed explanation as to why this is not prior art is set forth below and in the attached Rule 132 Declaration.

There was a translation error in preparing the U.S. application 10/733,395. [Rule 132 Decl. of K. Maeda, ¶4]. The original text in the Japanese priority application includes a word which should have been accurately translated as "modification" – but this was erroneously

translated as "typical." [Rule 132 Decl. of K. Maeda, ¶4]. This word "typical" (at page 5, line 10 of the specification) is an incorrect translation. The Examiner's rejection relies on this incorrectly translated word. Thus, the discussion at page 5, lines 10-13, of the instant specification is not prior art. [Rule 132 Decl. of K. Maeda, ¶4].

As described at page 5, lines 4-7 of the specification, the applicant had proposed a "structure of providing a plurality of driving circuits, which are individually driven or driven together, to at least one of the data signal line driving circuit or the scanning signal line driving circuit" (referred to as Arrangement A for convenience). Applicant had considered making modifications to Arrangement A, and, as an example of such a modification, thought of making the arrangement in which "one of the plurality of driving circuits are supplied with two-systems clock signal, and the remaining driving circuits are supplied with one system clock signal" (page 5, lines 10-13). [Rule 132 Decl. of K. Maeda, ¶5]. This is not prior art to the instant application. *Id.* This was incorrectly referred to as a "typical arrangement" and was illustrated in Fig. 11, even though the intended meaning was "a representative example of possible modifications considered by the Applicant." [Rule 132 Decl. of K. Maeda, ¶5]. The passage at page 5, lines 10-13, of the specification should have been translated as follows: "As a possible modification, this structure could be arranged so that one of the plurality of driving circuits are supplied with two-systems clock signal, and the remaining driving circuits are supplied with one system clock signal." [Rule 132 Decl. of K. Maeda, ¶5].

Thus, Figs. 11-12, and the original specification at page 5, lines 10-21, are not prior art. [Rule 132 Decl. of K. Maeda, ¶6]. Moreover, the "problems" at page 5, line 22, to page 7, line 7, of the original specification are not prior art problems. [Rule 132 Decl. of K. Maeda, ¶6].

The language "the described display device" at page 7, lines 17-18, beginning with "In recent years . . ." refers to the "typical display device" at page 2, line 4, of the instant specification (not what is discussed at page 5, lines 10-21 or Fig. 11). [Rule 132 Decl. of K. Maeda, ¶7].

As can be seen above, the material relied on in the rejection is not prior art, and Figs. 11-12 are not prior art. Thus, all rejections and objections should be withdrawn. It is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If any minor matter remains to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with regard to the same.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By: _____

Joseph A. Rhoa
Reg. No. 37,515

JAR:caj
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100